

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination to reopen prosecution after the Decision on Appeal mailed May 13, 2010.

Claims 1-6, 8-12, and 16-20 are pending.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 12 and 16-20 stand rejected in the final Office Action of February 15, 2007 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US Patent No. 6,898,762) and Cooper (US Patent No. 6,754,904).

Claims 4 and 11 stand rejected in the final Office Action of February 15, 2007 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis, Cooper and Haken (US Patent Publication no. 2004/0008972).

The independent claims are 1, 6 and 8.

Independent claim 1 is amended taking into consideration the Decision on Appeal comments on pages 8-9, namely the language of claim 1 emphasizes a first user setting a first search condition, a second user setting a second search condition for the first user and presenting to the first user search results based upon the first and second search conditions.

The final Office Action, the Examiner Answer to Appeal Brief and the Decision on Appeal, generally assert that Ellis' browsing for information by a user can meet the claimed first search condition and that Ellis' discussion of parental control can meet the claimed second search condition for the user.

In contrast to Ellis' and/or Cooper, the language of amended claim 1 emphasizes:

setting a first search condition, inputted input by any one user ~~among of a plurality of first users~~, for searching for information suited to ~~[[a]]this first user ...;~~

setting a second search condition, inputted input by any one ~~among the of a plurality of second users~~ in a way that specifies ~~a second a first user from among the first users~~, ***for searching information suited to this second first user, as second search condition information input by the second user on this second first user;***

...; and

presenting to the certain first user ... a searched result from the first search condition input by the first user and ... a searched result from the second search condition input by the second user.

Ellis and Cooper's parental control search conditions do not expressly or implicitly disclose presenting to the first user two search conditions including "***presenting to the certain first user... a searched result from the second search condition input by the second user***," since in Ellis and Cooper a first user would only be presented with a single search result based upon a search condition input by the first user and a search condition input by a parent. In other words, in Ellis and Cooper, the first user is not presented with a second search result based upon a second search condition input by a second user.

For the reasons discussed above, a prima facie case of obviousness of amended claim 1 over Ellis and Cooper cannot be maintained, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 6 and 8 emphasize limitations similar to the discussed limitations of claim 1.

Dependent Claim 2

In addition, for the reasons discussed above, dependent claim 2 is allowable, by further emphasizing a first user being presented with first and second search results based upon first and second search conditions set by respective first and second users, namely:

The information browse method according to claim 1,
wherein ***said second search condition information contains***
setting user information indicating the second user who set
the second search condition, and

... presenting presents to the certain first user the
setting user information of the second user to the ...
information elements searched based on the second search
condition ...

The remaining dependent claims inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in addition to the additional features recited therein.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Serial No. 09/964,637

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: July 13, 2010

By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501